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Mr. President,

At the outset let me thank President Tomka for the comprehensive report on the work of the Court, which allowed us to have an insight into the activity of the Court during the judicial year 2013-2014.

States submitting their disputes to the jurisdiction of the Court expect the main judicial organ of the United Nation to reach a decision after a very careful assessment of the relevant law and facts. These expectations were fully met in the case of the judgments delivered by the Court during the period under review.

For example, the case concerning the maritime boundary dispute between Chile and Peru was decided by the Court after a painstakingly detailed analysis of various agreements and other instruments to which the two states were a party. Significantly, the Court also reinforced and further refined its established methodology employed in relation to maritime delimitation. In the case related to whaling in the Antarctic the Court has likewise conducted a thorough examination of a vast amount of evidence – most of it of a complex scientific character – submitted by the parties and by expert witnesses.

We can only conclude that the activity of the Court has increased its scope and degree of complexity and commend the Court for its tremendous work. The current docket of the Court bears witness to the increased trust placed by States in the ICJ.

My country is a strong supporter of the Court and is committed to the settlement of all disputes in accordance with international law. Romania has been significantly involved with the work of the Court in the past – an example is the application submitted in connection to the delimitation of the
maritime spaces between Romania and Ukraine in the Black Sea. On 3 February 2014 an event marking five years since the delivery of the Judgment in this case was organized in Bucharest and benefited from the presence of Judge Keith and of several other leading personalities in the field of international law.

Romania intends to continue and strengthen its engagement with the Court. In this respect, let me briefly present the demarches undertaken so far as regards the possible acceptance by Romania of the compulsory jurisdiction of the ICJ.

In the report, the Court noted with appreciation that in its resolution 68/116, the General Assembly called upon States which have not yet made a declaration recognizing the Court's compulsory jurisdiction to consider doing so.

Romania is indeed considering joining the ranks of the countries which have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court and the Romanian authorities have taken several steps in this regard.

At the initiative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania, a public debate was launched last year concerning the possibility of accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. This public discussion generally showed support for the initiative, an approach shared by the Romanian authorities, the experts in the field of international law and the general public.

Following the conclusion of the public debate, a draft law on filing a declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court by Romania was prepared and was submitted to Parliament at the beginning of the current session. The draft law was approved by one on the chambers
composing the Romanian Parliament — the Chamber of Deputies — and is currently examined by the other Chamber — the Senate. There is thus a good chance that, at the time of delivery of the next annual report, Romania will already be among the States accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the ICJ — a further proof of our strong support for the Court.

I wish to conclude by expressing our conviction that in its future activity the Court will continue to uphold its usual standards of high professionalism and impartiality.

Thank you, Mr. President.